

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			General	1.	These comments are minor in nature. Please call or email me if you have any questions/concerns. I see that one of my suggestions was in the "Considered but dropped", but I thought I would mention it anyway. Thanks for the opportunity to review.	No Action Needed	Comment was FYI.
General			Question To Be Answered	2.	Trail and "trail segment" are used interchangeably. Need to clearly identify which attributes are a trail feature and which are a segment feature. This is paramount in defining the database and corresponding GIS data model. This needs to be explicit and part of this document.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	<p>(1) Many of the ITDS attribute definitions refer to the "trail or trail segment". In this context, "trail segment" is an informal term used only to identify that portion of trail that corresponds to the attribute "answer" or value selected for that attribute.</p> <p>"Trail segment" is not used in the ITDS definitions to identify or indicate officially recognized portions of trail, but rather to define the portion or entire section of trail to which a particular attribute value corresponds. The "segment" identified depends on the question being asked, or the data attribute and attribute value being recorded.</p> <p>For example, the data attribute State may be recorded for Trail ABC as "Montana" from mile 0.0 to 24.55, Idaho from mile 24.55 to mile 54.70, and Utah from mile 54.70 to mile 61.22. In this case, the attribute State is recorded by using three different attribute values that correspond to three different "segments" of trail. Another example for the attribute State, could be recorded as "Montana" for Trail QRS which lies entirely within the state of Florida, from mile 0.0 to mile 9.75. Hence the reference to "trail or trail segment" in several ITDS attribute definitions.</p> <p>For those same trails, the data attribute Trail Class may be recorded for Trail ABC as Trail Class 3 from mile 0.0 to 35.50, and as Trail Class 2 from mile 35.50 to mile 54.70. Trail Class may be recorded for Trail QRS as Trail Class 4 from mile 0.0 to mile 1.75, and as Trail Class 3 from 1.74 to mile 9.75. Again, in these example the "segment" refers only to the portion of trail where the recorded attribute value is applicable.</p>

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
							<p>In these examples, there is no correlation between the informally identified "segments" recorded for State and the "segments" recorded for Trail Class, as the attribute values usually change at locations independent of other data attributes.</p> <p>(2) The need for resolution of general spatial segmentation issues at the interagency level has been identified for follow-up between the ITDS Team, interagency GIS reps and the FGDC Travel Routes Team (Roads and Trails). (See also other GIS responses below)</p> <p>(3) Resolution of detailed spatial segmentation at the agency or trail-specific level is currently possible within various agency databases, depending on database capabilities, protocols, and data structure.</p> <p>In the case of the USFS' Infra Trails, for example, all ITDS attributes are recorded as linear events, each with it's own beginning and ending measure point (i.e. length). Many of these can also be displayed spatially, by trail or identified attribute segment. Depending on the question being asked, a lump sum total can be queried to answer the question (i.e. Miles of Trail Class 2), or a "slice" or snapshot taken at any given point on a trail to display the entire combination of attributes and values recorded for that location (i.e. Attributes values for Trail Class, Managed Use, and Designed Use at mile 6.5). While the intent of the ITDS is not to go to this level of trail-specific detail, this example is provided to illustrate the possibility of incorporating the ITDS and the utility of identifying data attributes by informal "segments"</p>

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			Question To Be Answered	3.	Some things should be covered elsewhere. For example why do we include maintenance data in the trail or trail segment data? This needs to be in a separate system with appropriate linkages to trail database.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	<p>The Interagency Trail Data Standards (ITDS) are <u>standardized definitions</u>, not data, a data structure, or a database. The intent is to develop a framework of standardized data definitions and to provide a basis for upfront interagency consistency. The ITDS do <u>not</u> establish a database, provide technical direction for the modification of existing agency databases, or provide GIS or database-specific direction. The ITDS simply identify common definitions/terminology and /or identify the need for crosswalk translation.</p> <p>The ITDS do not identify the source of the data (many existing data sources and databases will/can provide the "core" data), nor do they identify where the data is stored (i.e. tabular or spatial database).</p> <p>The intent of the ITDS is not to determine or drive data needs at a unit-specific level, but to define common <u>interagency</u> data standards applicable at the national, regional or state level.</p> <p>Each agency maintains the data needed for accountable, responsive trail management-- in most cases involving a greater level of agency, unit and trail-specific details than iden</p> <p>Individual agency database requirements remain agency-specific and driven by agency protocols. Specific database implementation decisions are at the discretion of each agency.</p> <p>1. Clarify intent of interagency trail standards-- the standards don't identify where the data is stored (i.e. tabular or spatial database), but just establishes standardized definitions.</p> <p>2. Add clarifier on data standard versus data dictionary / database (from PowerPoint) to reference material documentation.</p> <p>3. Talking Points need to clarify that the standards are the framework or definition of standardized info, not the data structure, database, etc. (Questions of which database, etc. are agency-specific)</p>

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			Question To Be Answered	4.	Need to clearly specify how the GIS layers fit into this data model. It seems like this is a tabular model with some "to be developed" treatment of feature definitions and specific structures (lines, points, polygons, regions, dynamic segmentation, etc.) What about coordinate systems? Datum?, etc? This stuff needs to be explicit up front.	Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	<p>Coordinate and resolve segmentation and spatial data records/display.</p> <p>The intent of the first draft of the ITDS is to agree upon tabular attributes, many of which will serve as a basis for corresponding spatial attributes. There are recognized geospatial components that are beyond the scope of these standards at this time, and will need to be addressed in the future.</p> <p>The ITDS team is working with trails GIS representatives within each of the three agencies and with the national leads for RecreationOneStop. In the case of the USFS, the majority of the ITDS identified as spatial standards have been incorporated in the USFS' National GIS Data Dictionary since at least 2002, with revisions planned to incorporate the remaining spatial ITDS.</p> <p>The team recognizes and is actively working on establishing the needed coordination with the interagency geospatial community. The team has made initial contact with the FGDC Roads working group and their associated reference materials, and will be developing a plan for collaborating with agency and FGDC geospatial reps. The team also welcomes opportunities to participate in any applicable geospatial efforts as appropriate.</p>
General		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #5- 6)	Question To Be Answered	5.	Potentially there are several databases linked rather than the one database described here: Trail segments/features with attributes pertaining to specific segments/features (bridges, etc), Maintenance (FMSS) attributes linked to trail features/segments, Overall "trail " database which is a summary or rollup of trail segments/features/maintenance.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See response for Comment No. 3.
General			Question To Be Answered	6.	Geopolitical divisions. This should be a derived value not coded into the trail segment info. This stuff changes. Includes congressional district, ownership, plans, etc.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	Recommendation to derive data, etc is agency-specific to a particular database, and while potentially applicable within the agency, not applicable at the interagency level.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #7- 8)	Question To Be Answered	7.	When the rubber meets the road – how does this happen? What is the responsibility of NPS trails or individual parks? What is the vision on who/how maintains this? Does each agency need to populate it? Is this envisioned as a central web database or a series of park maintained pieces.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	<p>1) See response for Comment No. 3.</p> <p>2) A subsequent task for the Interagency Trail Data Standards (ITDS) team will be the development of an Implimentation Schedule and Action Plan. The Schedule/Plan will need to represent realistic goals and timeframes, feasible for each agency. The Federal Interagency Council on Trails will prioritize implementation items and make recommendations to respective agency, departmental and/or OMB representatives. Additional implementation/collection strategies and timeframes will be developed by the agencies based on available funding and priorities. Decisions on data collection/management within agencies or at individual units will remain under the direction of the agency and/or unit.</p> <p>Once the standards and the Implementation Schedule and Action Plan are agreed upon, each agency will assess their current capability to meet the standards and, if needed or applicable, can reference the standards in the future evolution of agency systems. Collaborating agencies will be asked to share any existing trail information encompassed under the interagency trail data standards (at this point, this is envisioned to occur from existing databases).</p> <p>Implementation is planned to occur in coordination with the RecreationOneStop initiative, and the team's efforts are view interagency staffwork for the initiative.</p>

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			Question To Be Answered	8.	The maintenance info seems particularly problematic and would be very difficult to mesh with current maintenance systems (for NPS that is FMSS) and workflows.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	The definitions established for Trail Condition and Cost attributes are based on and incorporate USFS, NPS and BLM agency definitions and reporting capability for each of these items (see IDTS LOV Crosswalk Translation).  Interagency Team reps are working with Infra, FMSS, and FAMS developers who are indicating that incorporation of the trail data standards is possible and are drafting products to meet trail manager's needs. (e.g. the NPS' FMSS/MAXIMO Specification Template from the asset module is being revised to incorporate the interagency trail data standards; the USFS' Infra Trails database currently incorporates 95%+ of the ITDS, with plan underway to incorporate 100%).
General			Question To Be Answered	9.	Needs assessment is good. Questions to be answered is good. Needs to be significantly more effort on how to build the processes and procedures to make this all work.	Implementation	Agreed. See response #2 for Comment No. 7.
General			Question To Be Answered	10.	From an NPS perspective how will this mesh with park trail info and how will we implement?	Implementation	See response for Comment No. 8 and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
General		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #11-13)	Question To Be Answered	11.	My comments are in reference to the list of uses in the designed, managed, and prohibited uses. I was thinking that terms should be the same to avoid confusion. I.E. you use mtrcycl-motorcycle on one list and motor trailbike on other. You might want to compare the two lists.	Review and/or Edit Draft Standard(s)	Agreed—Applicable edits made to LOVs for trail uses (6/23/2003).  Certain uses, however, are appropriate LOV's under Prohibited Uses (i.e. Commercial Vehicle, Lowboy), but aren't appropriate for Designed Use or Managed Use and were not added to those attribute LOVs.
General			Question To Be Answered	12.	Also wondering why no 4WD trails?? in designed/managed list.	Review and/or Edit Draft Standard(s)	Added 4WD as LOV for Designed Use and Managed Use. Noted that these LOVs will not be used by USFS or NPS.
General			General	13.	I especially like the trail class and condition information. Will come in handy when we indentify some trails. Right now we're in the mapping and inventory stage. We're gathering information on width, use level, hazards, maintance level, difficulty rating, etc. I like the fact that we will be able to tier off of what you are developing and add the additional info we'll need. What an undertaking. Thanks for all the hard work.	No Action Needed	Comment was FYI.  Positive feedback on utility of Trail Classes.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			General	14.	Comments from the NPS Appalachian National Scenic Trail Park Office. Our comments are fairly extensive and for what it's worth I found the comment review form to be constricting.	Potential Revision of Review Form?	Comment considered-- only one received to this effect. Team concurred that we need to continue using a standardized comment review process and form that keeps comments focused, concise and constructive.
General		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #15-21)	General	15.	In conclusion, I would like to offer some over-arching observations and concerns.  (1) This whole effort strikes me as a prime example of a tail wagging dog and/or a freight train with no clearly identified purpose or known destination gathering steam and preparing to run roughshod over legitimate existing work activities.	No Action Needed	(1) The purpose is outlined in Q&A document, "Briefing for the Directors of NPS and BLM and USFS Chief", recent OMB direction, etc.  See response for Comment #3.  The Interagency Trail Data Standards project is a proactive response to OMB direction/guidance. The intent is to help craft the end product rather than having it imposed upon the trail community.
General			General	16.	(2) The proponents of this questionable endeavor credit a "key provision in a recent Memorandum of Understanding for the Administration and Management of National Historic and National Scenic Trails" as the reason why the Federal Interagency Council on Trails charged an interagency team with development of these trail data standards. I was concerned at the time that MOU was developed that it was rather lacking in substance and might lead to the generation of self-serving activities on the part of those engaged in trail program work (as opposed to actual trail management work).	No Action Needed	(2) Refer to Issues portion of "Briefing for the Directors of NPS and BLM and USFS Chief". Agencies have been directed by Congress and OMB to provide accountable inventory and cost data. The national NPS, BLM, and USFS program managers for NSTs and NHTs would be initiating this effort individually, and therefore the provisions in the MOU facilitated the potential efficiencies of interagency coordination. Field-level reps were involved, and the utility of these standards at the local level have been in the forefront of the standards development. (Note: ATC data standards were thoroughly reviewed and incorporated as appropriate, along with numerous other data dictionaries.)

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			General	17.	(3) I had hoped because it was filled with such verbiage as "encourages," "should" and "resolve as appropriate and feasible" that it would not take on a life of its own, but my worst fears have been realized in this trail data standards endeavor.	Coordinate with FMSS/FAMS/Infra agency reps  Coordinate with RecreationOneStop	(3) The trail data standards project is being compelled by the convergence of three drivers:  a. Law and presidential order have mandated that federal information must be available on the world wide web in a coordinated manner. Recreation was identified as one of the federal government's lines of business. OMB has determined that federal trail information falls under the purview of RecreationOneStop, the "electronic government" initiative for the recreation line of business. The portal for "one-stop shopping" for federal trail information will be recreation.gov. In addition, all federal geospatial data fall under the purview of the GeospatialOneStop initiative. Federal geospatial trail data will have to be coordinated between both initiatives.  b. Agencies have been directed by Congress and OMB to provide accountable inventory and cost data. Asset management initiatives are requiring standardized trail information from federal agencies.  c. Inventory, location, condition, and cost data is needed at all agency levels for effective and accountable trails manager
General			General	18.	(4) Ironically, justified initially to be for the benefit of long-distance trails, these proposed trail data standards are now seeking to be applied to "ALL park and program areas with oversight for trails and trail systems, or trails-related data," and are particularly ill-suited to a long-distance trail like the Appalachian Trail.	No Action Needed	(4) The potential benefits of common data standards for all agency-managed trails-- in terms of consistency, communication, and efficiency-- drove the decision to develop draft standards for all agency-managed trails. Many of the Core Questions and Data Standards were developed specifically with long-distance trails in mind (recognizing the need to resolve the GIS segmentation issue mentioned in other comments and in the draft standards).
General			General	19.	(5) The reference in the cover memo to this effort stemming from a "collective need to inventory, assess and map trail locations and trail resources across multiple jurisdictions throughout the United States" has never been adequately explained or justified to my satisfaction.	No Action Needed	(5) See responses for Comments No. 15, 17 and 18.



Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #23-24)	General	20.	(6) Without adequate justification to begin with, it now is contemplating the collection of data to a level of detail that in my opinion borders on the absurd. It certainly goes way beyond any information that the public is likely to be seeking through the Recreation One-Stop project.	No Action Needed	(6) Level of detail in Interagency Trail Data Standards is limited to the specificity that will be <u>useful</u> at national, regional and state level. The interagency data standards are actually very general compared to the specificity with which individual agencies and units collect and manage trail data. The Team's understanding is that RecOneStop will likely request additional data fields including trail amenities, scenery information, etc.
General			General	21.	(7) I believe that someone at a high level in the affected organizations, without a vested interest in trail "program" offices, ought to be reviewing this entire ball of wax with an eye toward evaluating whether it really serves any useful purpose at all.	No Action Needed	(7) The Interagency Trail Data Standards are a collaborative interagency effort for increased efficiency and communication. They were released for review under signature of the NPS Chief Information Officer, the BLM Assistant Director for Planning and Renewable Resources, and the USFS Deputy Chief for National Forest Systems.
General			General	22.	I concur with the proposed Draft Standards and have no additional comment at this time.	No Action Needed	Comment was FYI.
General			General	23.	The NPS GIS Committee (GISC) cannot recommend the Interagency Trails Data Standards as a standard for national park trail data as it is currently documented. Despite the problem areas the GISC identified, this is a commendable effort and first draft.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	See response for Comment No. 4.
General			General	24.	It could be used at a national level, as it is general in nature but not used at the park level.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	The standards were developed to be applicable to all trails at a national, regional or state level. Many of them are subsequently applicable at a more agency or unit-specific level (although that level of specificity was considered beyond the interagency scope-- See Core Question #3).
General			General	25.	The GISC would like to continue working with the Interagency Trail Data Standards Team to eliminate the deficiencies mentioned in these comments and recommends that other agencies such as USGS, a leader in the data standards arena, be included in the further development of the standard.	Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	See response for Comment No. 4.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General			General	26.	In addition to this memo, GISC members provided comment forms to your website as requested. Problem areas identified by the GIS Committee in the review of the National Trails Data Standard are:  1) NPS needs, especially park specific trail needs, are not well addressed;  2) The data structure is too general and does not include a GIS or geodatabase model; and  3) The impact and goals of the standard are unclear.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	1) The standards were developed to be applicable to all trails at a national, regional or state level. Many of them are subsequently applicable at a more agency or unit-specific level (although that level of specificity was considered beyond the interagency scope-- See Core Question #3). The intent of the comment/question is unclear. Would welcome any specific suggestions that respond to the Interagency Core Questions and meet Interagency Selection Criteria.  2) See response for Comment No. 4.  3) Refer to response for Comment No. 15.
General		Ambiguous Goals	General	27.	1) Is the final outcome of the standards implementation a national trails data system? If so, this should be documented somewhere, perhaps in a separate document.  2) The standard does not address practical procedures and processes for building the national data system or what one supposed to do with the standard trail data. What is the responsibility of NPS trails or individual parks? What is the vision on who/how maintains this trail data? Does each agency need to roll standard data up to an interagency system? Is this envisioned as a central web database or a series of park maintained pieces? The maintenance info proposed for inclusion seems particularly problematic and would be very difficult to synchronize with agency maintenance systems (FMSS) and workflows.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	1) No. See response for Comment No. 3.  2) See response #2 for Comment No. 7.
General		Ambiguous Goals (continued)	General	28.	This interagency standard is by default a national data standard but this is not clearly stated. If this is a national data standard, it should go through the Federal Geographic Data Committee process for review and approval. Trails are a very important feature on USGS quadrangle maps that many hikers rely on exclusively, yet USGS nor their trail data model is included in this effort. It would be best to build this as a national framework trails data layer of Geo Spatial One-Stop and Recreation One-Stop rather than just for the NPS, BLM and USFS. Isn't that the ultimate goal? Although this is a timely process it would help mitigate data conversion and re-acquisition of data in the future.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	As referenced in the Briefing Document for Directors and Chief, Talking Points, Q&A's document, and most associated document titles, the standards are proposed <u>national</u> and <u>interagency</u> trail data standards applicable to the NPS, BLM and USFS.  Throughout development of the ITDS, the team worked directly with agency leads for RecOneStop and RecML, with the understanding that the ITDS' would serve as the basis for the initial set of RecML trail data standards. As of 4/2004, the intent is to use the ITDS as the basis for RecML version 2 for trails.  See also response for Comment No. 4.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
General		Ambiguous Goals (continued)	General	29.	The conflicting following excerpts below are from the document, "Q&A.doc": "The national standards will only apply to National Park Service, BLM, and US Forest Service areas." "Existing databases will not have to change. Existing data will be transformed as applicable." "Some of the data standards may not be used by some agencies depending on immediate applicability and capability; however, the agencies have agreed to strive to use all data standards. Existing data will be used to the extent that the data can be transformed to meet standards." And from the document, "Talking Points.doc": "Data standards other than the national set may be developed at the regional, state or local level, depending on any protocols they establish."	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	Q&A's and Talking Points will be edited/clarified for consistency.
General			Question To Be Answered	30.	Are there any standards, descriptors etc. that could be used to ground- truth road, two-track and or trail? As we begin to document the presence of roads and two tracks from aerial photos or satellite imagery it would be helpful to use established standards for the analysis. Again, consistency with data collection and documentation would provide many benefits in addition to keeping us out of legal hassles. I know we have standards for BLM constructed roads, but as we know "roads" appear in many forms. Since we in Wyoming may not have the forms Mark {Goldbach} referenced ["BLM States have inventory forms that they use to document the existence of roads and trails."] could you please direct me to their location.	Add to Internal Review FAQs	The interagency Trail Standards should not be confused with road or trail inventory/maintenance/construction specifications. Various technical specifications exist within each agency. Recommend commenter contact BLM National Travel Coordinator for additional information.
			Question To Be Answered	31.	Looks pretty thorough and I wouldn't begin to comment on the subject matter.  The only question or concern I might have from a technical Geospatial data modeling perspective is how the spatial features (arcs) will be designed and managed. In order to implement this kind of data standard, each portion of a trail (arc) that has one or more different characteristics or attributes that a user could potentially need to select, view, or analyze separately from other portions that don't share that characteristic or attribute needs to be created and managed as a separate arc segment to distinguish it from others that are different. The system has wonderful tools for aggregation of individual arcs into other types of spatial features ( eg Routes ), but it cannot "split" spatial features that are aggregated in the beginning during the data collection or data entry process.	Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	Concur-- Commenter identifies several issues the team is aware of and working on with interagency GIS and FGDC Travel Routes reps. Note that in one or more agency-specific databases, several of the spatial ITDS have been successfully implemented and many of the GIS issues resolved. These models may serve as a basis for resolution of pending GIS spatial data issues at the interagency level.  See response for Comment No. 4.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
					A trail feature that transcends many different geopolitical boundaries and has many different surface types needs to contain individual arc segments that reflect those changes so a user can query and use them separately . Along with attributing standards, there should be a standard data model and standard data management procedures for accomplish this. I'm assuming the data modeling aspects have already been worked out and prescribed for this data standard. If they haven't, they should be fully considered before continuing. The devil is always in the details and they are most commonly overlooked until it's too late. A broad and detailed understanding of the user needs and what the data will be used for is imperative to designing a workable data model. Consideration should also be given to the amount of time and difficulty involved in converting or "retrofitting" existing legacy data into this model. No matter how wonderful and standardized your data plan is, it won't be useful unless and until it is universally accepted and implemented.		
Reference Materials			Question To Be Answered	32.	From my days as the Forest Service representation on the Standards Working Group it would appear that these Interagency Trails Data Standards: ( <a href="http://web.blm.gov/internal/wo-200/wo-250/trail_data/">http://web.blm.gov/internal/wo-200/wo-250/trail_data/</a> ) would fall within the current FGDC Ground Transportation Subcommittee (GTS). One item that I recall from the GTS standards is the management of segment administration, which doesn't appear in these draft standards. Has the Interagency Trails Data Standards reviewed the current FGDC Framework Standards ( <a href="http://www.bts.gov/gis/fgdc/">http://www.bts.gov/gis/fgdc/</a> ) as a bases for establishing these draft standards?	Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	See also response for Comment No. 4.
Reference Materials			General	33.	Is this a one time data request? Or, are we periodically going to be asked to submit this type of information?	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	This is not a data request. The standards provide a common framework for sharing consistent definitions, terminology and/or crosswalking translation to existing data within various agencies or partners.  No determination has been made to date on the frequency of data collection/update, although in most cases, once recorded, much of the data would remain static for several years.  See also response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Reference Materials			Question To Be Answered	34.	What does it mean, "The National Standards have taken into account the Department's Maximo application focus..."? NPS areas do not have the option of using any other application for trail assessment purposes; FMSS/Maximo is the only system used to track such information. The standards need to be workable in FMSS/Maximo and not require additional databases.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See response for Comment No. 8.  Also see response for Comment No. 3.
Reference Materials	A67	Basic Trail Information	New Attribute Needed	35.	Possibly add on to this question, or add a new questions - Does the trail cross agency boundaries? Is the trail ADA accessible?	No Action Needed	Several data attributes identify where the trail crosses agency boundaries (Agency, Admin Org, Managing Org, etc.); also will be addressed when the "segmentation" issue mentioned in other comments is resolved.  ADA suggestion is covered with attribute "Accessibility Status"
Reference Materials	A77	Trail Management & Use	New Attribute Needed	36.	Possibly add on to this question, or add a new questions- What facilities are available along the trail? Also - What is the difficulty of the trail - moderate, difficult, etc.?	No Action Needed	See Appendix D (cell B38-46): Team considered several versions of "things along the trail" and determined this would be dropped from further consideration at the interagency level because the information is too "detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level". Note: Many facility specifics will also be covered under recreation data standards, rather than trail standards.  Appendix D (cell B57): Team considered trail difficulty and determined this would be dropped from further consideration at the interagency level because the information is too "detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level".  The team agreed that both of these suggestions are very appropriate at the agency, unit or trail-specific level, just not at the interagency level based on the Core Questions.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Reference Materials	A77	TRAIL MGMT & USE	Definition	37.	Add the word "annually" - How much does it cost to manage the trail annually?	No Action Needed	Not applicable, as the general question encompasses both recurring annual/routine operations and maintenance costs, as well as the total deferred maintenance and capital improvement costs. The attributes Cost Annual/Cyclic Maintenance and Cost Annual Cyclic Operations include the words "annual/cyclic" in the attribute name. The attributes Cost Deferred Maintenance and Cost Capital Improvement are not intended to reflect the cost per year, but rather the total current cost.
Reference Materials	C24		Grammatical	38.	Superscript should be 3, i.e., NHT3	Review and/or Edit Draft Standard(s)	Edit made.
Reference Materials	C77	How much does it cost to manage the trail?	Question To Be Answered	39.	Are all offices expected to track all partner contributions? This is not possible for the AT and is not necessary.	No Action Needed	Agencies have been directed by Congress and OMB to provide accountable inventory and cost data. Accountable trail costing is required for NPS, BLM and USFS, regardless of whether the costs are generated by agency, contract, or contributed labor and/or resources.
Core Questions (Expanded)			Concept	40.	The database standards do not seem to be designed for long-distance national scenic trails at all. The breakdown of attribute values within each segment, for example trail maintaining club sections, forces an incredible amount of jurisdictional information to be extracted, which will subsequently break what is a reasonable segment into hundreds of pieces of information which essentially will have very little value in the long run in reporting to the user or anyone else what the trail at that location is actually like.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  (Tie in with NST work group)	See responses for Comments No. 2, 3, 4, 31, and 53.  The Interagency Trail Data Standards are designed to address/respond to a wide and dynamic variety of questions. The data will be recorded once, but standardized and available to respond to a variety of questions. The standards define the "what" in terms of consistency, not the "how" of data collection and/or management (i.e. databases). <u>The informal/spontaneous segment is defined by the question asked or the parameters of the query.</u> As a result of this question, the team will review the data model to ensure that it supports and clearly communicates intent of data standards.

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Core Questions (Expanded)			Concept	41.	The implementation of this database in a field office, which would ultimately mean creating a type of node that would communicate with an on-line trail database system, would be incredibly resource intensive in terms of amount of bandwidth consumed, the hardware resources involved with maintaining a fire wall and the expertise in managing the database depending on what software is chosen. Quite honestly it seems like a waste of time considering the database itself may only get a few outside hits a month.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	See response for Comment No. 3.  Also see response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Core Questions (Expanded)		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #42-43)	Concept	42.	(1) Who is the audience for this information?	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	(1) The audience, as identified in the PowerPoint that accompanied the review materials includes (per ITDS Team Meeting July 10-11, 2002): <u>Customers:</u> - Interagency counterparts - Congress - Partner organizations - General public (Media, trail users, info seekers, educators, researchers) - Travel and Recreation Industry (service providers) - Advisory boards - Intra-agency (GIS, budget, facilities, resource specialists, cultural and natural, related "ologists")  Include target audience in next set of written reference materials.
Core Questions (Expanded)			Concept	43.	(2) Do we think many future hikers or members of the general public really care about the land use plan of a one-tenth of a mile section in Pennsylvania that is not handicap accessible, on state game lands, is managed by the Maryland Mountain club, has an existing right of way, is a united nations biosphere reserve and is restricted from all motorized vehicle use. Is this something that we want or need to provide?	No Action Needed	(2) <del>Yes</del> . The Interagency Trail Data Standards are designed to address/respond to a wide and dynamic variety of questions. The data will be recorded once, but standardized and available to respond to a variety of questions.  Refer to ITDS Core Questions, and the purpose and need outlined in Briefing for Directors and Chief, Talking Points, and Q&As. Refer also to the response for Comment #3.

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Core Questions (Expanded)			Concept	44.	<p>1) If the true intent of this initiative is to develop a standard database or set of data that can be obtained from each unit within each agency, it seems there are several key questions that need to be answered or addressed before a set of standards are developed.</p> <p>2) For example, why does each agency need to maintain similar data sets and/or share data with each other? The only time this seems to be of real importance is when dealing with truly interagency situations, such as long distance trails or wildfire management and response (neither of which respect agency jurisdictional lines). Why can't each agency report information differently? The need for doing this should be further explored and better defined. If the intent is solely so the public can access information about trails, this can be achieved using a very limited set of information from each agency, much less detailed than what is asked for here.</p>	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	<p>1) The intent is not to develop a database, but a <u>standardized framework of common data definitions</u></p> <p>Refer to Core Questions and response for Comment No. 3.</p> <p>The intent is not to gather data at a unit-specific level, but to define data standards applicable at the national, regional or state level. Subsequent levels of detail may result as a product of these standards, but in most cases folks would go to the specific unit to obtain the site-or unit-specific data.</p> <p>2) Each agency will be maintaining the data needed for accountable, responsive trail management. The efficiencies of a minimum common data framework between agencies are outlined in the Briefing for Directors and Chief, Talking Points, and Q&amp;As.</p>
Core Questions			Concept	45.	Many considerations of level of attribution will be greatly dependent on the data structure chosen to manage/depict trail information in the GIS, i.e., routes, networks, dynamic segmentation.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See response for Comment No. 4.
Core Questions	B13		Concept	46.	Feel some of the "ephemeral" attributes, especially congressional district and municipality should be removed (this concept is relevant for many other items as well when there is the potential for the trail information to become dated)	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See response for Comment No. 3.
Core Questions	B63		Concept	47.	Financial details of trail should be maintained separately	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See Core Question #12 and response for Comment No. 3.
Core Questions	B74		Concept	48.	Details of visitor centers not relevant for trail	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See Core Question 14 and response for Comment No. 3.
Core Questions	B82		Concept	49.	Details of facilities too numerous to be relevant to trail	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	See Core Question #15, response for Comment No. 3. See also Appendix D.



Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Core Questions	B110		Question To Be Answered	50.	Aren't NST trail segments certified also?	Review and/or potentially Edit Draft Standard(s)	NHT Certification is required and specifically defined in the National Trails System Act for non-federal trail segments. NST certification is determined on a trail-by-trail basis (not mandated by the Act), and not consistently implemented on all NSTs. Will work with future NST work group to determine if this meets review criteria and is needed for NSTs.
Core Questions	I17	LENGTH	Attribute Not Needed	51.	Not appropriate under where is the trail	No Action Needed	Length helps answer the question "Where is the trail" when the trail crosses more than one jurisdictional boundary (i.e. 4.5 miles in County A and 3.7 miles in County B, etc.). Length is a derived value (not a stored value), that changes based on the question. The informal/spontaneous segment is defined by the question asked or the parameters of the query.  Refer also to the response for Comment No. 2.
Draft Attributes			Definition	52.	(1) The unit of measure needs to be better defined. A short trail seems fairly obvious, the trail itself is the unit of measure and all attributes are reported for the entire trail. What would the unit of measure be for a 2,000+ mile trail? We can report most of these items for the entire trail, but are we expected to break the trail down into segments and report all attributes for individual segments? How would you define a "trail segment" for a long distance trail? The answer to this question will have a major impact as to whether we can answer the questions at the requested level of detail as well as how much time and effort is involved for us to do so.	No Action Needed	Refer to the response for Comment No. 2.  The informal/spontaneous segment is defined by the question asked or the parameters of the query. Units of measure are also defined, in the same way, depending on the question being asked. In most cases, the common unit of measure is miles, although most linear units of measure can be electronically converted to respond to the specific question asked. For example if the question is "What state(s) does the trail cross?", the answer would be reported as trail miles by state, and any associated attributes required by the question. If the Question is "What are the trail kilometers by county?", the answer would be reported as trail kilometers by county, and any associated attributes required by the question.

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes			Allowable Values For Attribute	53.	No matter how we breakdown or segment the trail, many of the attributes will overlap on the AT; why is "no overlap allowed"?	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	<p>The "Overlap Allowed" indicators are used to identify those individual data attributes where only one "answer" or attribute value is appropriate at any given location, versus those data attributes where more than one "answer" or attribute value could be applicable at a single location. Each indicator as listed refers to that single data attribute, and whether more than one value for <u>that attribute</u> can be recorded for the same location or segment of trail.</p> <p>For example, any specific segment of trail is only located in one State at any given location (i.e. for the data attribute State, no overlap between LOVs for that attribute is allowed). But any specific segment of trail may be covered by more than one Land Use Plan, including for example, the XYZ Comprehensive Management Plan and the XYZ Resource Management Plan (i.e. for the data attribute Land Use Plan, multiple values would be allowed, if applicable, for that attribute).</p> <p>The "Overlap Allowed" indicator is not intended to identify whether or not multiple data <u>attributes</u> may occur at any given location, only whether multiple <u>attribute values</u> or "answers" are allowed for any given attribute. Also note that many attribute values may be populated from spatial layers, rather than tabular data, depending on individual database/spatial layer capability.</p> <p>See Overlap Allowed footnote "****" on the ITDS LOV sheet for an expanded explanation of "No Overlap Allowed" versus "Multiple Values Allowed".</p>
Draft Attributes		(Note: Split by ITDS Team from one comment into comments #54-55)	Question To Be Answered	54.	<p>(1) Many of the attributes we will not be able to answer using FMSS/Maximo.</p> <p>(2) Will we be expected to use another spatial database to answer these questions?</p>	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	<p>(1) See response for Comment No. 8.</p> <p>(2) See response for Comment No. 3.</p>
Draft Attributes			Question To Be Answered	55.	(3) Who will be expected to manage and compile all of this data? A central office employee or park/forest/trail employee? Due to staffing and equipment limits, the AT may not be able to answer many of these questions.	Implementation	<p>(3) See response #2 for Comment No. 7.</p> <p>(Note: The USFS currently has a national requirement for this basic data to be collected and recorded for all National Forset System Trails.)</p>

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes			Question To Be Answered	56.	What is the format in which this information should be reported? There is reference to spatial and tabular products, but what are the specific formats? Access databases? Excel Spreadsheets? GIS data layers? GeoDatabases? ArcIMS compatible data? etc... Each format is going to require a different set up and additional time/cost to provide. Also, the AT is not capable of providing certain formats at this time.	Implementation	See response #2 for Comment No. 7.  Formats will be based on the question and the implementation strategy.
Draft Attributes	All of A	ALL	Name	57.	ESRI/Arc allows only 16 characters for attribute/item names.	No Action Needed	The attribute names are logical business names identified to ensure consistent communication/interpretation, and do not represent the required physical database names that may/may not be used in individual databases (i.e. the attribute name "National Trail Designation" may appear in one data base as "Natl_Tr_Desig" and in another as "NTD", etc...)
Draft Attributes	A11	TRAIL STATUS	Definition	58.	need to clarify trail segment vs trail.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	Refer to the response for Comment No. 2.
Draft Attributes	A12	LENGTH	Attribute Not Needed	59.	calculated value let GIS manage it	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	1. See response for Comment #51.  2. See also response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A16-A25		Attribute Not Needed	60.	Calculated valued by GIS not part of segment attribute	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A16	AGENCY	Concept	61.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A17	ADMIN ORG	Concept	62.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes	A22	GEO- LOCATION	Concept	63.	This is a huge question and needs to be addressed - "to be determined" is not acceptable. GIS data model needs to be part of this design.	Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	Exactly. Interagency Team is aware of the complexities, has identified several issues for resolution and, <u>per the notes in the draft standards</u> , initiated efforts to work with agency counterparts and corresponding FGDC roads group for consistency. Potential solution not ready for interagency review at this time.  See also response for Comment No. 4 and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A24	MUNICIPALIT Y	Attribute Not Needed	64.	not appropriate to code into database. Not terribly practical to think GIS could do it.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A24	MUNICIPALIT Y	Concept	65.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A25	STATE	Concept	66.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A26		Concept	67.	This raised question of trail vs trail segment. These seem like trail segment attributes	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	May be applicable to an entire trail or trail segment.  Refer to the response for Comment No. 2.
Draft Attributes	A28	LAND USE PLAN	Concept	68.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes	A33	MOTORIZED PROHIBITED	Concept	69.	It seems as if the attribute Motorized Prohibited is out there all alone. Perhaps it could be related to different types of closures in this way: Add a new attribute called CLOSURES with picks of emergency, seasonal, year_long. Within emergency have a "from" and "to" date and tie to those dates the picks that might be the reason or restriction of an emergency closure (motorized vehicle prohibited, Public hazard, etc.). Within seasonal have a "from" and "to" date and tie that date to the picks that might be the reason or restriction of the seasonal closure (motorized vehicle prohibited, Public hazard, big game winter range, critical habitat, etc.). Within year-long have the picks; motroized prohibited, public hazard, special status species present etc. Whatever other things that might be the reason or restriction in a year-long closure.	Consider revision of attribute definitions or notes?	The Motorized Prohibited data attribute answers a question periodically aske by Congress and others: Which trails are closed to all motorized use?  The Prohibited Uses data attribute goes to the next level of detail by identifying particular uses that may be prohibited (i.e. maybe motorcycles are allowed, but ATV's are prohibited.).  Tracking specific travel management strategies by season of use, however, results in an almost never-ending combination of use ans season combinations, requires a much more complex set of data and data coding, and goes beyond the intent of Core Question #9. Travel Management information beyond this level of detail, while often important at the agency or trail-specific level, was dropped from consideration under the <u>Interagency</u> Trails Data Standards. Refer to Appendix D "Managent & Use".
Draft Attributes	A38	NATIONAL TRAIL	Concept	70.	If trails are maintained in one large and very	Contact reviewer to clarify question. (Helen)	(Incomplete comment. Reviewer contacted. No further clarification from reviewer.)
Draft Attributes	A39	RIGHT-OF- WAY	Concept	71.	May not be necessary in the OHV or trails coverage because this type of information is available and maintained in another separate administrative coverage. These attributes are not OHV specific. Maintaining the same attributes in more than one coverage can become a maintenance and conflicting data headache.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A40	SPECIAL MGMT AREA	Concept	72.	Special Management Areas also have their own coverage. However it would be great to have this attribute to be able to know at a glance in the OHV or trails coverage that the route or trail crosses an SMA and the type of SMA (ACEC, RNA, SRMA, ONA etc.). Then we could bring up that specific SMA coverage to access the details (attributes) of the SMA and relate them to the route or trail.	No Action Needed	Thanks for the feedback.  Also see response for Comment No. 3 and response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes	A41		Concept	73.	This stuff is in maintenance records, not in trail database. Do not try to capture that in this database. Also the question of reature/segment/trail is critical.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	The ability to systematically inventory and cost was identified as important information at interagency level, and has been identified as a critical need by OMB and all three agencies. Needed standardized, high-level terminology to be able to answer the question. These 4 cost categories meet that need, while encompassing existing agency-specific cost definitions/categories. (Again, the standards are not a database, but reflect <u>standardized terminology</u> for sharing/combining/comparing info).  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A42-46	FINANCIAL INFORMATIO N ATTRIBUTES	Concept	74.	Financial aspects of trails managed by BLM are in relational databases called FAMS, RMIS, FFS. Those financial attributes can be brought into the GIS table and made spatial by common unique identifiers used in both the financial databases and the GIS. Maintaining those financial attributes in duplicate in both the GIS and financial databases seems unnecessary and could lead to maintenance nightmares and problems caused by conflicting data.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft Attributes	A49-A54		Concept	75.	These are all 1:many relationships	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	This is not true for all data attributes, as in the case of one NHT that may have many Visitor Centers (1:many); but each of those Visitor Centers only has one set of contact info (1:1). Note that the 1:1 or 1:many relationship is captured under "Overlap Allowed".  Refer also to the response for Comment No. 53.
Draft Attributes	A55		Concept	76.	These are GIS feature attributes. Need to specify how GIS features are defined.	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	See response for Comment No. 3.
Draft Attributes	A67	MILEAGE SOURCE	Attribute Not Needed	77.	This needs to be stored in the GIS trail metadata	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Correct. As noted in Interagency Trail Data Attributes [Draft Attribute Tab], "Mileage Source" is considered metadata.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft Attributes	A68	NRHP PROPERTY CATEGORY	Concept	78.	need nat register id, do not duplicate national register system inside trails	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Core Question #21 identifies the need for NRHP Property Category information to help answer the Core Question #17 "What known heritage resources are thematically associated with the NHT?". The trail data standard does not infer the need to duplicate data, but defines a <u>consistent definition and framework for sharing the data</u> . The data attribute was identified by nationally appointed interagency NHT reps well-versed in the National Register, agency-specific heritage data standards and corresponding data, etc.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3.
Draft Attributes	B21	COUNTY	Definition	79.	Reword to - County, burough, or parish in which the majority of the route segment physically resides.	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Refer to the response for Comments No. 2 and 17.  The basic premise is that at local or trail-specific level, data will be recorded by beginning measure point (BMP) / end measure point (EMP) for the trail or trail segment-- to provide accurate, quantified mileages for each data attribute.  For County: Intent is to specifically know which trails and their length by County.  Attribute definition will not be edited to add "the majority of", as this does not meet the specificity premise identified above.
Draft Attributes	B31	DESIGNED USE	Concept	80.	Trails/segments can be more that one of these things	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Refer to the response for Comments No. 2 and 53.  Refer to Appendix B for definition of Designed Use (the <u>single</u> limiting factor that controls the geometric design-- and hence maintenance/construction specifications-- for the trail). While there may be more than one actively Managed Use, there is only one Designed Use (limiting factor /design driver) that controls the technical specifications for a trail or trail segment.

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs		Data Structure	Allowable Values For Attribute	81.	This standard needs to specifically articulate data structure, terminology, definitions, models, and entity-attribute relations. It should also define standard coordinate systems, datum and other basic geographic and cartographic parameters. This is greatly lacking in the current standard. Park trail questions as those above can often best be answered using a dynamic-segmentation data structure for linear features such as trails. However, no attempt is made in this standard to specify the type of spatial data structure or entity attribute relationships to be used. In fact, there is little documentation of any type of data structure whatsoever. Trail and "trail segment" are used interchangeably. It is not identified which attributes are trail features and which are segment features. This is paramount in defining the database and corresponding GIS data model. This needs to be explicit in the document and is critical to the success of the effort and ability to maintain the data.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency GIS & FGDC Reps	It is recognized that each agency will design/revise/implement their databases individually, dependent on their agency protocols and needs. Many of the points raised can/will be resolved pending the aforementioned coordination with the GIS/FGDC community, while others will not be resolved at the interagency level, but rather within each agency. The Interagency Trails Team plans to follow-up on each of these points to ensure appropriate resolution if determined applicable at the interagency level.  Refer also to response for Comments No. 2, 3, and 4.
Draft LOVs		Data Structure	Attribute Not Needed	82.	Too many attributes are planned for inclusion (e.g., Congressional District, State, or Special Management Area) that would be better left as separate independent layers, to be used in combination with the trails data layers as needed. The relational database attributes associated with trails should be only those that pertain to trails per se. Trail maintenance data should be stored in a separate data base system (i.e. FMSS or MAXIMO, ORACLE) with appropriate linkages to the trail database to reduce redundancy and error, and increase update and synchronization efficiencies.  Below is a list of potential separate databases linked rather than the one database described in the standard: Trail segments/features with attributes pertaining to specific segments/features (bridges, etc); Maintenance (FMSS) attributes linked to trail features/segments; Overall "trail" database which is a summary or rollup of trail segments/features/maintenance; and Geopolitical divisions. This should be a derived value not coded into the trail segment info. These data change and need to be updated independently as needed. Include congressional district, land ownership, plans, etc.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.



Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A2			83.	Need to be more implicit re: core/nominal fields that should be systematically addressed at a programmatic level, e.g., sensitivity of information, acceptable use, liability re: use of these data for navigation, etc.	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions  Coordinate with Interagency & FGDC Reps (i.e. metadata identification)	This a "starter set" placeholder for associated metadata. The Interagency Trails Team, working in conjunction with the GIS community will ensure the final set of metadata determined to be necessary and applicable at the interagency level, is FGDC compliant.
Draft LOVs	A40	CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT	Attribute Not Needed	84.	This potentially changes every 10 years, better to obtain these details through spatial analyses	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	True, although specific database implementation decisions are at the discretion of each agency.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A41	COST ANNUAL / CYCLIC MAINTENANCE	Question To Be Answered	85.	Does this apply to the whole trail or individual trail segments, i.e., resolution of fiscal information? Also, probably best to ingest this information relationally via AM/FM system, e.g., FMSS for NPS	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, response #2 for Comment No. 7, and response for Comment No. 37.  Intent of Core Question #12 "How much does it cost to manage the trail?" is to be able to answer this question at the state, national or interagency level (i.e. the cost of managing a particular long-distance NHT, the total cost of managing trails at the state or national level, etc). Cost details by individual trail segment, trail feature, etc, while valuable at the agency or trail-specific level, go beyond the intent of the ITDS at the <u>interagency</u> level.
Draft LOVs	A41	COST ANNUAL / CYCLIC MAINTENANCE	Concept	86.	For these four cells, I am concerned that they require annual updates unlike the other information in the standard which for the most part is a one time entry. I don't believe this is the appropriate place to track costs.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A42	COST ANNUAL/ CYCLIC MAINTENANCE	Question To Be Answered	87.	Does this apply to the whole trail or individual trail segments, i.e., resolution of fiscal information? Also, probably best to ingest this information relationally via AM/FM system, e.g., FMSS for NPS	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 85.
Draft LOVs	A42	COST ANNUAL / CYCLIC OPERATIONS	Concept	88.	For these four cells, I am concerned that they require annual updates unlike the other information in the standard which for the most part is a one time entry. I don't believe this is the appropriate place to track costs.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A43	COST DEFERRED MAINTENAN CE	Question To Be Answered	89.	Does this apply to the whole trail or individual trail segments, i.e., resolution of fiscal information? Also, probably best to ingest this information relationally via AM/FM system, e.g., FMSS for NPS	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 85.
Draft LOVs	A43	COST DEFERRED MAINTENAN CE	Concept	90.	For these four cells, I am concerned that they require annual updates unlike the other information in the standard which for the most part is a one time entry. I don't believe this is the appropriate place to track costs.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A44	COST LAST UPDATED	Question To Be Answered	91.	Does this apply to the whole trail or individual trail segments, i.e., resolution of fiscal information? Also, probably best to ingest this information relationally via AM/FM system, e.g., FMSS for NPS	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 85.
Draft LOVs	A44	COST LAST UPDATED	Concept	92.	For these four cells, I am concerned that they require annual updates unlike the other information in the standard which for the most part is a one time entry. I don't believe this is the appropriate place to track costs.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A45	COST IMPROVE MENT/ CONSTRUCT ION	Question To Be Answered	93.	Does this apply to the whole trail or individual trail segments, i.e., resolution of fiscal information? Also, probably best to ingest this information relationally via AM/FM system, e.g., FMSS for NPS	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 85.
Draft LOVs	A45	COST IMPROVE MENT/ CONSTRUCT ION	Concept	94.	For these four cells, I am concerned that they require annual updates unlike the other information in the standard which for the most part is a one time entry. I don't believe this is the appropriate place to track costs.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A46	COUNTY	Attribute Not Needed	95.	Best to obtain from standard counties coverage via spatial analyses	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	True, although specific database implementation decisions are at the discretion of each agency.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A47	DESIGNED USE	Concept	96.	Possible additions to the list - Livestock & Emergency use/access	Add to Internal Review FAQs	<p>1) Refer to the response for Comment No. 80.</p> <p>"Pack and Saddle", which includes horses and mules, is currently listed as a Designed Use. Livestock is interpreted to mean cattle, sheep, etc. Per the interagency definition of a trail (Reference Materials), livestock passageways are not considered agency-managed "trails". Although livestock passage may occur on an existing trail, livestock passage would not be considered a design driver for trails per the interagency definition.</p> <p>2) Appropriate emergency access is dependent upon the trail specific Managed Uses, and corresponding types of emergency response equipment. In the case where the need for emergency access is specifically identified as a design driver/construction need, this can/should be incorporated under the corresponding Designed Use by adjusting any trail-specific technical specifications as needed for the trail.</p> <p>For example, the actively Managed Uses may be identified as Hiker/Pedestrian and Bicycle. Of these, Bicycle is the <u>design driver</u> or Designed Use. If the need for emergency access is identified as an integral part of the trail design, construction and maintenance specifications, that would be reflected through the trail-specific technical design/construction/maintenance specifications (i.e. removable bollards to allow entry of emergency vehicles at trail access points, trail width and turning radiuses accommodating emergency vehicles, etc.).</p>
Draft LOVs	A47	DESIGNED USE	Question To Be Answered	97.	Need to allow for multiple entries? Many trails need to be designed for multiple uses. How would you chose the one that's most appropriate?	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Refer to responses for Comments No. 2, 53, and 80.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A83	LAND USE PLAN	Question To Be Answered	98.	A single trail's management practices can be guided by many land use plans depending on location. How wil the appropriate plan be tagged to the appropriate trail segment?	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	True-- there may be numerous plans and planning documents associated with any given trail or trail segment. At the interagency level, it was determined that only the "high level" plans (Forest Plans, Resource Management Plans, General Management Plan and NST/NHT Comprehensive Management Plans) meet the review criteria for identifying interagency trail attributes. While this attribute provides basic information, it is not intended to be site-specific and that information would need to be obtained at a more agency-specific or local level.  Refer also to responses for Comments No. 53 and 99.
Draft LOVs	A83-A87	LAND USE PLAN	Definition	99.	This is a 1:many relationship. Need more than doc name	Clarify through Documentation & Instructions	Per interagency evaluation criteria, the team determined that additional details beyond this are not applicable/needed at interagency level. Official Plan Name, when combined with Trail Administrator, or Admin Org will provide sufficient information to track down the document. The intent is to provide minimum info needed on this as high-level reference, but not provide extensive document details that would be readily available within each agency or at a sub-unit level.  Refer to response for Comment No. 53.
Draft LOVs	A89	MANAGED USE	Concept	100.	Possibly add - Emergency use/access	Add to Internal Review FAQs	See response #2 for Comment No. 96.
Draft LOVs	A121	MANAGING ORG	Question To Be Answered	101.	How does this vary from Admin Org?	Add to Internal Review FAQs	Admin_Org refers to the administrative unit where the trail physically reside (i.e. in the case of the USFS, the Rangre District). Managing_Org refers to the entity with management responsibility in terms of decision-making, funding and implementation activities for the trail. In most cases the Managing _Org value will be the same as the Admin_Org value.  An example of where Admin_Org and Manaiging_Org would not be the same, would be trail running along the boundary between USFS and BLM lands (Admin_Org = USFS and BLM by trail segment), but where there is an agreement in place for the BLM to manage the trail (Managing_Org = BLM).

## Comment Review and Disposition

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A127	MUNICIPALITY	Attribute Not Needed	102.	These vary over time so there's the potential that information becomes dated or incorrect if it's imbedded with the trails data structure. Best to obtain this information through spatial analyses.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	True. Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A139	NHT HIGH POTENTIAL SITE	Attribute Not Needed	103.	Relevant for trails data structure? Sites along trail should be managed separately!	No Action Needed	Refer to "Understanding the NHT Corridor Concept" (Reference Materials), for explanation of NHT2 which reflects the routes and/or sites where history actually occurred. Per Core Question #18 (Core Questions--Expanded), this data attribute was determined to be needed to answer the question.
Draft LOVs	A141	NHT PUBLIC USE SITE	Attribute Not Needed	104.	Relevant for trails data structure? Sites along trail should be managed separately!	No Action Needed	Refer to "Understanding the NHT Corridor Concept" (Reference Materials), for explanation of NHT2 which reflects the routes and/or sites where history actually occurred. Per Core Question #21 (Core Questions--Expanded), this data attribute was determined to be needed to answer the question.
Draft LOVs	A142	NHT SITE NAME	Attribute Not Needed	105.	Relevant for trails data structure? Sites along trail should be managed separately!	No Action Needed	See response for Comment No. 104.
Draft LOVs	A143	NHT SITE NUMBER	Attribute Not Needed	106.	Relevant for trails data structure? Sites along trail should be managed separately!	No Action Needed	Refer to "Understanding the NHT Corridor Concept" (Reference Materials), for explanation of NHT2 which reflects the routes and/or sites where history actually occurred. Per Core Question #17, 18, 20 and 21 (Core Questions--Expanded), this data attribute was determined to be needed to answer the question.
Draft LOVs	A200	SPECIAL MGMT AREA	Attribute Not Needed	107.	Would be better to obtain these details through spatial analyses and not imbed information in data structure	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	True. Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A226	STATE	Attribute Not Needed	108.	Better to obtain information through spatial analyses	Clarify Documentation & Instructions  Implementation	True. Refer to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A227	NHT/NST TRAIL ADMINISTRATOR	Attribute Not Needed	109.	Duplication of A128	No Action Needed	True. It appears you may have reviewed a pre-final version on the NPS site. Thanks for catching this.

Internal Review: Interagency Trail Data Standards  
**Comment Review and Disposition**

4/29/2004

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A236	TRAIL CONDITION	Attribute Not Needed	110.	Condition is probably too variable to include at this level. Should obtain details through facilities management system.	No Action Needed	This attribute responds to Core Question #11, information frequently required by Congress and OMB (as referenced in the Briefing for Directors and Chief, and Talking Points). While site-specific conditions may vary frequently, this interagency trail attribute represents an "umbrella" attribute that reflects the general trail condition, based on individual agency trail condition definitions. In implementation, it is likely that this data will be derived and/or reported through cost and maintenance data.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 8, response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A265	TYPE OF SITE	Attribute Not Needed	111.	Relevant for trails data structure? Sites along trail should be managed separately!	No Action Needed	Note: This attribute applies only to NHT2 sites. Refer to "Understanding the NHT Corridor Concept" (Reference Materials), for explanation of NHT2 which reflects the routes and/or sites where history actually occurred. Per Core Question #21 (Core Questions--Expanded), this data attribute was determined to be needed to answer the question.
Draft LOVs	A292	VISITOR CENTER NAME	Attribute Not Needed	112.	Points along trail, e.g., visitor centers, need to be maintained separately with their own data standards/structures. Can be related spatially as needed.	No Action Needed	This attribute responds to Core Question #14, which was identified as valid at the interagency level for NSTs and NHTs.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A293	VISITOR FACILITY ACTIVITIES	Attribute Not Needed	113.	Not relevant	No Action Needed	This attribute responds to Core Question #15, which was identified as "pending validation" at the interagency level for NSTs/NHTs. This validation is expected to occur through planned attribute identification and review driven by the RecreationOneStop (R1S) initiative.  Refer also to response for Comment No. 3, and response #2 for Comment No. 7.
Draft LOVs	A294	VISITOR FACILITY CONTACT INFORMATIO N	Attribute Not Needed	114.	Not relevant	No Action Needed	See response for Comment No. 113.

**Comment Review and Disposition**

Spdsht Tab Name	Spreadsheet Cell No.	Attribute Name	What is Comment About?	Comment No.	Comment	Type of Follow-up Needed	Comment Response / Disposition (ITDST 6/26/2003)
Draft LOVs	A295	VISITOR FACILITY LOCATION	Attribute Not Needed	115.	Points along trail, e.g., visitor facilities, need to be maintained separately with their own data standards/structures. Can be related spatially as needed.	No Action Needed	See response for Comment No. 113.
Draft LOVs	A296	VISITOR FACILITY TYPE	Attribute Not Needed	116.	Details of facility types would be maintained more efficiently in separate data structure.	No Action Needed	See response for Comment No. 113.
Draft LOVs	C156	NATIONAL TRAIL DESIGNATIO N	Grammatical	117.	One of the NHTs should be NSTs	Review and/or potentially Edit Draft Standard(s)	Good catch-- edit has been made.
Appendix D		Incomplete Needs Assessment	New Attribute Needed	118.	The proposed Trail Data Standards may be appropriate for national scale data development but will not be useable or maintainable at the park level. The following statement in the document titled, "GIS Memo" may identify the source of the problem: "The team developed trail data standards based on key questions and data reporting needs at the national, regional and state levels for trails of all kinds." Local level needs aren't mentioned. Clearly, these standards are largely intended for planners working with broad landscape issues, not with specific, on-the-ground maintenance work. Additional questions that arise at the park- or site-level of management include, "Where are water bars?", "Where are trail markers?", and "Where is erosion occurring?" Appendix D in "Draft Interagency Trails Data Standards.xls" mentions some local level needs, such as trail depth, but dismisses them as "Too detailed, specific, and/or costly for tracking at interagency level." These elements are critical to park trail management and have impacts on visitor use and safety.	Clarify Documentation & Instructions	Agreed. Accurate and site-specific data is needed for responsible trail program management at the local level for all units. It is anticipated that the variety of agencies and numerous units involved will have a very expanded and even customized set(s) of data attributes that respond to site-specific, unit and agency data needs. The Interagency Trail Data Standards reflect "roll-ups" of a small, standardized subset of data, that's been determined to respond to the Interagency Core Questions and to be applicable at the national, regional or state level. The identification of this standardized subset of common interagency data is in no way intended to diminish the importance of, or imply the replacement of expanded site, unit or agency-specific data sets.